

### Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Timeline

1991-1994	Parcel A: 23 USTs Removed, Site Inspection, Soil Removal for DDT and sand blast grit from 1993-1994
Aug, 1995	Parcel A: Feasibility Study Report (Low level of motor oil remain and deed restriction imposed). No further action
Nov, 1995	Parcel A: Record of Decision (No Further Action)
1999	Parcel A: Removed from EPA National Priorities List
2002	EPA Rad Scanner Van Survey
Feb, 2004	Parcel A: Former worker alleged Ra-226 contaminated storm drains ignored by Navy (SF Chronicle reported allegation May, 2018)
Summer, 2004	Parcel A: Tetra Tech EC Inc. tested and demolished Bldg 322, EPA Health Physicist scanned and found no elevated levels of rad
Oct, 2004	Parcel A: Final Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST), following several carve-outs after discoveries of concerns
Dec, 2004	Parcel A: Transferred to the City of San Francisco
2006	Earliest allegations from former workers of Tetra Tech EC wrongdoing listed in NRC Petition (e.g., conveyor belt ran too fast, portal monitor alarm ignored)
2006	Earliest signs of Tetra Tech EC Inc. data quality problems found in EPA reviews, e.g., Parcel B missing scan data
2008	Former workers alleged that soil sample swapping began this year
Oct, 2012	Navy asked Tetra Tech EC Inc. about K-40 anomalies, on sign of falsification
2013	Tetra Tech EC Inc. resampled hundreds of locations with K-40 anomalies. In five broad areas, they found results higher and did more cleanup
April, 2014	Tetra Tech EC Inc. report of its internal investigation and stated that issues had been resolved.
Sept, 2015	Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2 (adjacent to Parcel A) transferred to City
Feb, 2016	NRC Notice of Apparent Violation – 2 workers swapped samples at 10-15 locations in Parcel C
March, 2016	NCB news former worker allegations
March, 2016	EPA asked Navy to launch investigation
July, 2016	EPA, DTSC, RWQCB told Navy verbally no further transfers until issues resolved
Sept, 2016	EPA, DTSC letter to Navy saying above
Oct, 2016	EPA written recommendations to Navy to begin sampling at locations of higher concern
Dec, 2016	EPA refined written recommendations for the same under Enrique's signature
Jan, 2017	Navy proposal to do statistical radiological data evaluation
Jan, 2017	EPA response that statistical analysis does not confirm any given data are not necessarily falsified, recommend do not delay resampling
May, 2017	Navy suggests using Area Averaging instead of Not To Exceed. EPA immediately says that is inconsistent with past practice at this site and other EPA sites and EPA written policy
June, 2017	Navy again suggests using Area Averaging instead of Not To Exceed, EPA immediately says that is inconsistent with past practice at this site and other EPA sites and EPA written policy

**INTERNAL, DELIBERATIVE, PRE-DECISIONAL DRAFT – Do not quote or cite or release under FOIA**

Aug, 2017	Navy suggests 12 mrem/year new cleanup standards. EPA responds that is inconsistent with past practice at this site and other EPA sites and EPA written policy.
Sept, 2017	Navy draft Parcel B and Parcel G soil reports estimating 14 – 50% of survey units show signs of falsification
Oct, 2017	EPA emails show 90-97% survey units show signs of falsification or data quality concerns
Nov, 2017	Navy agrees to resample all survey units, but to re-excavate a small subset. EPA gives Navy in writing quotes and page numbers from EPA guidance showing that 12 mrem/yr and Area Averaging are inconsistent with EPA written policy
Nov, 2017	EPA proposes “proveout” path forward
Dec, 2017	Navy gives counter-proposal that includes Area Averaging and resampling much smaller subset of parcels
Feb, 2017	Navy, EPA, DTSC, CDPH senior management meet re path forward
Feb, 2017	Navy draft Workplan
March, 2017	EPA, DTSC, CDPH comments on draft Workplan
April, 2018	Navy Clarification proposal

**INTERNAL, DELIBERATIVE, PRE-DECISIONAL DRAFT – Do not quote or cite or release under FOIA**